TAV

MAY 2.5 2007 W

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Daniel Mahgerefteh et al.

Serial No.:

10/615,218

Filed:

07/08/2003

For:

WAVELENGTH DIVISION MULTIPLEXING SOURCE

USING MULTIFUNCTIONAL FILTERS

Group Art Unit:

2613

Examiner:

Dalzid E. Singh

Attorney's Docket No.:

 $TAYE-5\,9\,4\,7\,4-0\,0\,0\,0\,8_{\textrm{I}\,\textrm{HEREBY}\,\textrm{CERTIFY}\,\textrm{THAT}\,\textrm{THIS}\,\textrm{CORRESPONDENCE}\,\textrm{IS}\,\textrm{BEING}\,\textrm{DEPOSITED}$

WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, ON:

Mail Stop Issue Fee

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

May 21, 2007

(DATE OF DEPOSIT)

Margaret M. Slezak

(NAME OF ATTORNEY

Sir:

May 21, 2007

(DATE OF SIGNATURE)

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Applicant is submitting this STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW in response to the INTERVIEW SUMMARY mailed in connection with the above-identified patent application.

The undersigned Attorney was contacted by Examiner Dalzid E. Singh by telephone on April 9, 2007. The Examiner indicated that he would like to issue an Examiner's amendment to (i) amend claim 2 in order to clarify the "fiber optic system", and (ii) amend claim 23 so that the method of claim 23 corresponds to the system of claim 1 and to the figures. Examiner Singh stated that after the amendments were made, the application would be put in condition for allowance.

At that time, the undersigned Attorney and Examiner Singh did not reach an agreement as to how claims 2 and 23 should be amended.

On April 13, 2007, the undersigned Attorney left a voicemail for Examiner Singh with instructions for amending claims 2 and 23. Subsequently, on April 19, 2007 Examiner Singh issued a NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND FEE(S) DUE, including an Examiner's Amendment. The substance of the amendments to claims 2 and 23 agreed to by the undersigned Attorney was substantially incorporated into the Examiner's Amendment of April 19, 2007.

However, the undersigned Attorney found the following clerical errors in claim 23 of the Examiner's Amendment:

- (1) in line 3, the terms "partially" and "substantially" were previously deleted in the AMENDMENT filed on January 29, 2007;
- (2) in line 5, the words "a multiplexed laser signals" should read "multiplexed laser signals"; and
- (3) in lines 6 and 8, the words "substantially AM" were previously deleted in the AMENDMENT filed on January 29, 2007.

The undersigned Attorney does not believe that there was a discussion of specific prior art.

Lastly, the undersigned Attorney believes that this STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.333. If for any reason the Examiner considers otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned Attorney be contacted by the Examiner by telephone in order that any deficiencies may be expeditiously remedied.

In the event that any fees may be required in this matter, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Slezak

Registration No. 55,625

Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.

470 Totten Pond Road

Waltham, MA 02451-1914

Tel. No.: (781) 290-0060

MMS/TAYE5947400008.stat